

The Architect Must Resist Usurpation

While architects have not had a New Deal, their professional place is very generally accepted by the public, both in residential and industrial building work. In the "horse and buggy" age, it was common practice to construct different kinds of buildings without the service of architects. Happily, this is not true today and advancement in education and State registration of architects has raised their practice to a high plane.

The advice "consult an architect" frequently seen in newspaper and magazine articles and in paid advertisements and literature of manufacturers, is but one indication of the acceptance. Another important indication is that many insurance companies and building and loan associations do not make building loans unless an architect is engaged for the operation. It is now commonly accepted that residential and industrial buildings have a greater sale value if architects' services have been used, and the time may arrive when a statement from an architect certifying that the building was planned and the construction supervised by him, will be a necessary document in the sale of the property.

In view of these facts, it is surprising to find some contractors and building material producers still resorting to "horse and buggy" methods and taking advantage of the depression to secure the services of architectural draftsmen to render architectural services for small compensation. In some cases the illegal practice of having a licensed architect stamp the plans is being resorted to.

These concerns seem to lose sight of the fact that one of their valuable assets should be to cultivate good will among architects, instead of subjecting them to unfair competition, and that the added business to be gained by their methods is small compared to the amount they may lose when the facts are made known to the profession.

An architectural firm having a large practice in store front modernization and remodeling has advised that its business has been considerably curtailed by glass manufacturers furnishing free drawings and specifications of not only the glass work but also of the accompanying work in other materials. There are many large manufacturing concerns that encroach on the architect's province—firms that solicit business from the architect—and for their own building programs hire a draftsman and do their planning.

A national paint manufacturer is doing just this in the Chicago vicinity at the present time. Another case is a large corporation allied with a building supply manufacturer that does all of its own planning of branch stores and buildings. Such companies surely are not entitled to consideration of their materials by the architect.

Much work has been lost to the profession by elevator companies selling direct to the owner new and modernizing equipment and having doors and cabs designed by a manufacturer. Escalator installations have been made involving major changes in the structure of the building without architectural services.

The ends to which material manufacturers will go in the matter of furnishing architectural services can best be

illustrated by quoting several letters which are on file in the secretary's office. The first letter is written on what is apparently a letterhead of a national building supply company. The letter is addressed to one of our members.

"Dear Sir: As a building manager, trustee or receiver, you are vitally interested in maintaining your buildings for 100% occupancy at a minimum cost.

We have been contracting and executing general building reconditioning in all its various phases for the past forty years, and can meet your every requirement, no matter how small or large, speedily, efficiently and to your entire satisfaction.

FULL ARCHITECTURAL SERVICE AND COUNSEL REGARDING ANY TYPE OF BUILDING, REMODELING OR ALTERATION WILL BE FURNISHED.

In contacting us you incur no obligation whatsoever, and we will give immediate attention to your inquiries. References furnished on request.

Respectfully yours,

All designs by (Manufacturer's Name) for every architectural need."

The building supply company was communicated with and they sent the Society a copy of their letter to their Chicago Manager. We quote:

"We were very much disturbed to receive in this morning's mail a letter addressed by your company on our letterhead, supposedly to contractors, but **THROUGH ERROR NO DOUBT, ONE OF THESE WAS RECEIVED BY AN ARCHITECT.** In your letter you propose to do contracting and general building reconditioning and offer your 'full architectural service and counsel' in connection with this remodeling.

As you undoubtedly know, this company has enjoyed the confidence of the architects throughout the country for a good many years and we have always worked with them, and it is not our intention to have this letterhead showing (manufacturer's name) cuts and designs used in this manner because of the unfavorable reaction on the part of the architects as a whole.

Will you, therefore, please cease advertising full architectural service and counsel, with our request that you work through the architects.

May we hear from you?

Very truly yours,"

From the above letter, particularly that part which we have capitalized, the manufacturer seems to feel that his only error was that one of the letters was received by an architect. However, we think good has been accomplished in this case and that the manufacturer's prompt action in the matter is commendable.

Letters and advertising of this sort are sought by the Society from its members.

It might be interesting to some of our younger members to go back for a time to an occurrence which only our older members will recall. The case is the Columbus Memorial Building. The architect was W. W. Boyington; the general contractor, George A. Fuller Company; the marble contractor, William Henry Burke. Burke was an Englishman and was brought to this country by McKim. He was a great friend of D. H. Burnham and Henry Ives Cobb. He was a real designer, but not an architect. The owner of the building was Henry J. Furber. Burke, by clever manipulation, discredited the architect in the mind of the owner with the result that he, Burke, in addition to his contract for furnishing and setting the marble was given the designing of all the corridors, stores, the main lobby and even the bronze store fronts. He employed our old friend Trost as designer for the bronze work. We do not recall the amount of money involved, but it was a considerable amount even in those days. The net result of the operation, which was carried out without any architectural supervision or check, was a grand lawsuit.

The architects meekly submitted to the government action in the matter of public work. It is manifest that the great majority of the men employed by the government in this work received their training in offices of the profession.

The Sixty-Eighth A. I. A. Convention

Few conventions achieve the perfect combination of charm and interest of locality, good attendance, perfect weather, and a well-oiled and not too controversial business procedure. The sixty-eighth convention of the American Institute of Architects accomplished all of this to a marked degree, with the result that most of the delegates look back on the occasion with a pleasant memory of four days of good fellowship and unusual architectural inspiration. It is true that some were disappointed in the fact that controversy was avoided, and the enjoyment of a good knock-down and drag-out fight was denied them. However, whether such dramatic occasions at other conventions have ever been of lasting benefit to the profession, is questionable.

During the week-end of May 3, the delegates converged on Old Point Comfort and Williamsburg. Many were in their own cars, and better times were evidenced by the predominance of 1936 models. The ferry from Cape Charles brought most of the eastern delegates. Western and southern delegates arrived by the boat from Washington, the C. & O. Railroad, and the fine highway from Richmond. Arriving by boat at 6:30 in the morning and disembarking at a wharf within a stone's-throw of the Convention Headquarters was a pleasing novelty to those whose convention experience has been confined to Washington and other large cities.

State Association members arrived a day early for the special meeting on May 4. With John R. Fugard of the Illinois Society of Architects as chairman and representatives of nine state societies in attendance, the meeting was called to order on Monday afternoon. After the introduction of several resolutions bearing on the subject of State Association affiliation with the A. I. A., the meeting adjourned until Tuesday, leaving in the hands of a committee the task of preparing a resolution expressing the general sense of the meeting on this subject. This resolution, passed at a Tuesday morning meeting, recommended careful study of the entire question by a special committee of the Institute, for the purpose of devising the most comprehensive, practical plan for the coordination of the efforts of the entire profession. The resolution further recommended that no change be made this year in the by-laws insofar as these affect State Association membership in the Institute. This resolution was carried.

On Tuesday morning the Convention of the A. I. A. was called to order by President Voorhees. Without attempting to give a chronological account of the proceedings of the convention,

It may be that we have lost our sense of humor and need a Gilbert and Sullivan to bring before us, in words and music, the comedy of the present situation.

The "I, Aye, I" articles by Lewis Horowitz published in the *Saturday Evening Post* during the last few months do not lend any particular dignity to the profession.

To what conclusion does all this bring us. Does it not demand of us zealously, vigilance, ethics, and—in every way—dignity worthy of our profession?

This is not a one-sided question. The architects have a responsibility as well, and they should refrain from asking any contractor to make drawings for them. There is a willingness on the part of the terra cotta makers to furnish rendered drawings of store fronts and alteration work which when furnished are submitted as the architect's own work! Surely, there can be little difference, from an ethical standpoint, whether the architect with a contractor's presentation or a contractor with his own presentation sells the owner.

It would be helpful if any member unearthing practices such as we have mentioned would notify the Society in writing, as many have already done. In this way a list of the offenders can be made.

—Howard J. White, *Committee on Architects Practice.*

a few of the outstanding features will be of interest to those who did not have the opportunity of attending.

The convention opened with the President's address. This sounded the keynote of the convention, and stressed the necessity of a program looking forward to the next ten years of Institute activity. President Voorhees also stressed the importance of effective local effort in solving the many problems confronting the profession.

Those who attended the 1935 convention at Milwaukee will remember the long and fruitless discussion of the revision of the by-laws. Under the influence of Virginia sunshine, this subject was quickly and harmoniously disposed of in record time at the Tuesday meeting. In the afternoon the convention met as a committee of the whole, with C. Herrick Hammond as chairman. Under his suave and able leadership, difficulties were quickly discussed and ironed out, and the entire revisions with few modifications were passed at the evening meeting. The election of officers was also completed at this meeting, the result being the re-election of the present officers without competition.

Much of the routine business having been disposed of, the convention moved to Williamsburg Wednesday morning and really began to enjoy itself. Williamsburg itself was at least half of the convention, and before the day was over the delegates realized the debt of gratitude owed to John D. Rockefeller, Jr., through whose philanthropy the restoration of this early American city was made possible. The convention committee had wisely spread the convention period over four days, which eliminated afternoon sessions and permitted the delegates to roam at will through the Capitol Building, the Governor's Palace, the Raleigh Tavern, the Sir Christopher Wren Building and the many other points of interest in colonial Williamsburg.

On Thursday, the convention session opened with a discussion of housing. Following the report of the Institute Committee on Housing, the discussion was largely confined to architectural service for the small house. The convention was informed as to how plans for group activities had worked in Washington, Buffalo and New York. A good many delegates thought that the housing discussion was too limited and did not enter sufficiently into the complicated problems involved in slum clearance, low-cost housing, and other vital problems of the day. The temptation to take the wheels of the housing machine apart to see how it works, in spite of possible difficulty in putting it together again, was strong. A special

(Continued on Page 5, Column 2)

Officers

ELMER C. JENSEN.....	<i>President</i>
39 S. LA SALLE ST. TEL. RANDOLPH 3024	
ARTHUR WOLTERS DORF	<i>Vice-President</i>
520 N. MICHIGAN AVE. TEL. WHITEHALL 4849	
GEORGE B. HELMLE	<i>Second Vice-President</i>
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS	
RALPH C. LLEWELLYN.....	<i>Treasurer</i>
38 S. DEARBORN ST. TEL. CENTRAL 1969	
HAROLD B. McELDOWNEY	<i>Secretary</i>
612 WASHINGTON ST., GLENCOE, ILL.	
H. I. PALMER	<i>Financial Secretary</i>
134 N. LA SALLE ST. TEL. CENTRAL 4214	

Board of Directors

For One Year.....	WILLIAM P. FOX	HOWARD J. WHITE
For Two Years.....	JOHN R. FUGARD	HENRY J. SCHLACKS
For Three Years.....	TIRRELL J. FERRENZ	LEO WEISSEN BORN

Board of Arbitration

RICHARD E. SCHMIDT

E. S. HALL	IRVING K. POND
HERBERT HEWITT	F. J. THIELBAR
ERNEST R. GRAHAM	CLARK WRIGHT

Editor Monthly Bulletin

ARTHUR WOLTERS DORF, 520 NORTH MICHIGAN AVE., CHICAGO

Gentlemen of the Architectural Profession:

The leading article in this issue of the Bulletin is a vivid picture by Howard J. White of a condition existing today tending to disintegrate the private practice of architecture in this country. Every practitioner should read it and ponder over the evidence.

Most states have enacted legislation to license architects after proving their fitness before an examining board in order that the public be protected. Prosecution of violators is observed mainly in the breach. Recently the Illinois Society's attention was drawn to a case where a lawyer advised his client to circumvent the employment of an architect for a very considerable building by splitting the building into parts built in sections, each section costing less than \$7500.00, the maximum cost of a building where exemption of architects' services is permitted by the Illinois law.

The Bulletin is starting on a campaign to publicize practices by manufacturers and building materials dealers who aid and abet the destruction of the legitimate practice of architecture. Mr. White's article carries letters illustrating the point. Future issues of the Bulletin will present names of concerns with their correspondence. Can a practicing architect be presumed to voluntarily consult with and specify material furnished by a concern bent on eliminating him, when anyone else not so disposed is available?

The Society has placed this matter in the hands of the Committee on Architects Practice: Howard J. White, Chairman; Alfred S. Alschuler, John R. Fugard and John A. Holabird.

The Chicago Building Code is obsolete. Often amended, it contains many inconsistencies and contradictions. In recognition of these failings, a commission of architects and engineers was appointed in the last administration of Mayor William Hale Thompson to draft a new Building Code that would permit planners to take advantage of the advance in materials and methods in the science of building, thereby reducing the cost to property owners.

For six years these men labored without pay, meeting weekly. But the aldermanic committee showed no disposition to further the matter and public hearings, a proceeding to allow criticism before enactment, were never called during the Thompson administration.

Mayor Cermak's administration came and went. The commission continued its labors, and still little interest on the part of the City Fathers, though in 1932 and 1933 public hearings were held, followed by discharge of the commission.

Then came Mayor Kelly. January 24, 1934 the Mayor appointed a new commission under the chairmanship of F. J. Thielbar. The new commission worked assiduously, hoping to complete its labors and provide Chicago with a scientific, practical, up-to-date Building Code by the summer or fall of 1935.

The commission presented its case and a resumé of its labors before the Illinois Society of Architects at their January, 1935 meeting. Among those who spoke were Chairman Thielbar, Assistant Corporation Counsel Gorman, Engineer Shapiro and Sanitary Engineer Hubbard. Presentations were made before other architectural and engineering societies. In the April-May, 1935 issue of the I. S. A. Monthly Bulletin, Mr. Thielbar had an article "Chicago's New Building Code—What it Aims to Accomplish."

The many sections and sub-divisions of the proposed code were mimeographed on the advice of Alderman McDermott, Chairman of the Building Code Committee, to permit written criticism by those interested. The criticisms were studied by the commission and clauses altered when, in the commission's judgment, improvements could be made. An attorney from the Corporation Counsel's office assisted.

The architects' present activity for the new code should result in its early passage. Most American municipalities of size are in advance of Chicago in their efforts to recognize by ordinance the advance in the science of building.

Percy Thomas, President, Royal Institute of British Architects, contributes to the April number of "Architecture" a four page argument on unlimited competitions for public buildings. He argues for and against in the five points he sets up. His concluding paragraph reads: "Finally, I am of opinion that the competing system has a good stimulating effect upon architectural design. It holds out hope and encouragement to the young and hard-working assistant, and I find that public authorities are justly proud of the fact that the designs for their public buildings were obtained in competition open to the whole country."

"Architecture's" editor prints with Mr. Thomas' article two lists of American architects of distinction, dead and alive, showing their ages when these outstanding works were first commissioned. The first list enumerates fifteen names and the buildings won in competition. Competitors' ages run from 30 to 44, the average age being 37.13 years. The second list gives eight names, ages, and the outstanding building, where the commission to design was awarded without competition. Among these eight the age range is from 24 to 46, the average being 35.5 years.

It would, perhaps, be fairer in making a comparison of achievement by age to have the same number in each list, but with the lists before us, the conclusion reached is that achievement among men of talent comes earlier in direct commissions than among architects in competition.

April and May Illinois Society Meetings

After listening at these monthly meetings, at intervals during the last three years, to loan plans to encourage building by the various alphabetical government agencies, the Illinois Society of Architects at their April 28 meeting gave attention to the presentation of the same subject by the loan division of life insurance companies. For this purpose there had been invited to speak to the fifty-six assembled architects, six men representing the loan offices of six life insurance companies. Of these six, three appeared, talked and answered questions.

The first of these to be introduced by Chairman Jensen was A. J. Faraday of the Prudential Life Insurance Company, who explained the procedure with his company on mortgage loans. His company loans at present on single residences, apartments, apartments with stores, but not on industrial plants. The speaker climaxed his talk by showing the advantages of their twenty year self-liquidating loan which is scaled as high as 66⅔% of the property value. The company also has a sixteen year loan highly recommended. On the question of interest rates, Mr. Faraday walked on eggs, feeling that the loan market played so important a part in the money rates that the subject of rates at a public meeting was a delicate one. All this referred to new construction loans. Answering questions, the speaker made clear that his company valued not alone architects' plans but architects' supervision as well, though they could not be too insistent on the latter.

F. R. White of John Hancock Life Insurance Company was next introduced. He had no address to give, contenting himself with the remarks that at this time his company was loaning only on single residences—loans extending over ten years and with a \$16,000 limit. His company insists on the architect's supervision of his planned structure.

Mr. Atwater of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company was introduced. His company, as is well known, carries all sorts of building loans and is today forced to handle many of the buildings which have fallen into their hands. Looking ahead, Mr. Atwater finds the time opportune for junior loans. This brought forth many questions and some surprise in view of the effort of the Federal Government to discourage these, particularly in modest house construction, as exemplified by the FHA insurance contract. Mr. Atwater replied that the plans of the RFC make junior financing possible and advantageous.

The Financial Secretary, H. L. Palmer, had prepared a paper to be read before the Society on the state of the profession in Illinois. The chairman now called for the reading of this paper. It dealt with candidates and new members after examination in the profession, the administration of the licensing law, unfair advantages that prospective owners sometimes take of the profession through the eagerness of clientless architects to get work, and other ethical and unethical practices that exist, notwithstanding the protestations in codes of ethics and the like. After the reading, the paper was open to discussion and E. Stanford Hall, Secretary of the State Examining Board of Architects, replied—not in extenso—but reminded the hearers that administration of the law also required machinery for investigation and punishment of violation. This machinery and funds were still lacking.

Leo Weissenborn, chairman of the Program Committee, announced that in view of general clamor for a meeting without fixed program in order that members might bring up for discussion any professional questions agitating their minds at the moment, the May meeting would be a free-for-all open forum.

■ ■ ■

After dinner to thirty-five members on May 26, the regular monthly meeting of the Illinois Society quickly turned to the business of the evening which was an open forum for discussion as announced at the April meeting. After Secretary McEldowney's minutes were read, the President immediately called John J. Davey, who talked on the revised Building Code which every Chicago architect hopes will be enacted into law before many months. He advised minor—though important—changes in the present draft, where concrete sewers replace burnt-clay sewers. He prophesied passage of the ordinance by January 1, 1937. Architects were urged

to attend a meeting before the Committee of Aldermen on May 28 in order to show the City Fathers that real interest prevails. Robert L. Franklin took the floor to explain the mechanics of the Code. President Jensen dwelt on the Code from the point of view of reducing cost of building.

Mr. Franklin now rose to discuss the subject of architects' registration and the strength and weakness of the Illinois law. In another column of this issue, Mr. Franklin presents his case.

Victor A. Matteson spoke on the competition offered architects by so-called "private plans" and H. L. Palmer supplemented.

Mr. Hall, as an Illinois architect examiner and Secretary of N. C. A. R. B., spoke on Illinois registration authority, citing the law and its non-enforcement in the matter of corporations practicing architecture. He read legal opinions which were printed in the February-March, 1936 I. S. A. Bulletin. These opinions brought other members to their feet, questioning the constitutionality of the opinions since other lawyers of equally good standing had guided incorporated architects of position. Irving K. Pond expressed his opposition to all architects' license laws. George B. Helmle of Springfield wondered at the position of the Illinois Secretary of State in granting corporation papers to architects if Mr. Hall's citations were constitutional.

April and May Chapter Meetings

Mr. Heimbrodt's minutes are distinguished for accuracy, clarity and conciseness. Corrections to them by members of the Chapter are unknown. After the Secretary's reading of the March minutes at the April monthly meeting falling on the 14th, President Hall immediately proceeded to the program of the evening, namely, Irving K. Pond's review of Hugh Morrison's book "Louis Sullivan—Prophet of Modern Architecture."

This review was written for presentation before the Chicago Literary Club a month ago. It was held so pungent and penetrating that Mr. Pond was asked to read it to the architects. Mr. Pond complimented the author on his painstaking listing of all the Adler and Sullivan and later Louis Sullivan work, but held that the author magnified his hero at the expense of Sullivan's contemporaries. Morrison at least, said Pond, concedes what other Sullivan glorifiers have not, namely, that Sullivan was influenced by Richardson's designs.

Mr. Pond considered Sullivan an artist rather than a pioneering architect. He paid his respects to Sullivan for marvelous dexterity of draftsmanship in rendering his ornament. The book is held inaccurate by Mr. Pond in a number of instances, one of which is in the discussion of offsets in high buildings. Morrison inaccurately refers to Pond's publishing his design for building offsets in high structures in 1908, whereas the publication occurred in the "Brick-builder" in 1898.

George C. Nimmons, whose appreciation of Sullivan and review of Morrison's book appeared in the February-March number of the I. S. A. Bulletin, spoke next on the book and his own knowledge of Sullivan's architectural aims. Henry K. Holsman reminisced regarding the genesis of Sullivan's Cedar Rapids bank and St. Paul's Church in the same town. The symposium was brought to a close by President Hall speaking of Sullivan's leaning on Schneider for modeling of ornament.

The President now turned to the business of the forthcoming A. I. A. convention at old Point Comfort and Williamsburg. Victor Matteson, as Chairman of the Pre-Convention Committee, reported on the efforts and accomplishments of his committee. John Merrill, Chairman, Committee on Architectural Services for Housing, read a long resolution which was endorsed by the meeting for presentation to the national committee.

Alfred Granger, one-time Chapter President and now living in the East, was a pleasant surprise visitor. He had been calling on Mrs. Gregory, he said, and seeing lights in the Architects Club, he remembered this was Tuesday and so came to meet his old confrères.

A resolution endorsing the proposed Chicago Building Code, as presented by the Chicago Building Code Commission, was passed.

■ ■ ■

The regular monthly meeting of the Chicago Chapter was post-

poned a week because of the Convention in Williamsburg the first days of May, so May 19 at the Architects Club of Chicago, the Chapter met with Benjamin F. Betts, lately editor of American Architect and now associated with Purdue Housing Research Project, as principal speaker. He was preceded by Secretary Heimbrodt's report, who also read a treasurer's report showing returning prosperity. President Hall appealed for active interest and action to influence the Chicago Common Council in favor of the early passage by the Council of the proposed new Chicago Building Code.

The returned delegates to the Convention of the A. I. A. were called upon individually to speak about that Convention. Those responding were: John Merrill; Carl E. Heimbrodt; Henry K. Holsman, who stigmatized most of the Convention discussion as "spineless;" Elmer Roberts, who felt that architects generally should work more disinterestedly for the public good, thus obtaining for the profession public glorification; William Jones Smith, who spoke ecstatically about what were to him three thrilling speeches and was transported mentally into the clouds by his reception at a certain old Virginia mansion; and George C. Nimmons, who told of a legacy left by Edward Langley of Pennsylvania through which the A. I. A. profits by a gift of \$104,000, the interest on which shall be used for architectural education. President Hall dwelt on his visit to Monticello after the Convention.

Elmer C. Jensen announced a hearing to be given the architects by the City Fathers in City Hall on Thursday, May 21, apropos the proposed building code.

Mr. Betts' paper on the Purdue Housing Research Project was interesting. He made clear that the object primarily was a cost analysis of housing for 75% of the families in the country. This 75%, it was assumed, could not afford a house costing over \$5000. Of the ten individual and distinctive houses that the project plans to build, five are now practically completed. All but the first house are sponsored by some industry allied with building, though the cost of construction is paid for out of the funds of Purdue Housing Research. The research will include the experiences of dwellers—Purdue professors in this case—who will recite the joys and sorrows of the occupant in every kind of weather. The I. S. A. Bulletin for February-March 1936 outlined the construction of these five houses.

Mr. Betts' paper was followed by drawings as well as progress photographs on the screen. Fifty men attended.

Benjamin Wistar Morris, Architect of New York, served as joint counsel and designer on the planning and decoration of salons of the Queen Mary and as personal adviser to Sir Percy Bates, chairman of the Cunard White Star Board.

Cement-coated asphalt shingles will soon go on the market. Better fire resistance, less erosion, greater insulation properties and fewer shingles per roof are among the advantages claimed for them.

The Illinois Architectural Act

The Legislative Committee of the Illinois Society of Architects has been requested to bring to the attention of the members, certain items in the Illinois Architectural Act to which objections have been raised. These objections are in the nature of expressed wishes for stronger enforcement, and the suggested amendment of certain sections, but not in any case a softening of requirements of the Act.

This Committee believes it would be to the best interest of all concerned if we could obtain expressions from members of the Society, with definite suggestions for amendments thought to be desirable. When agreement is reached on the different sections in question, it is believed the Society should make recommendations to the State Department of Registration and Education requesting that department to cooperate in presenting a draft of proposed amendments to the next regular session of the State Legislature in 1937.

As a leader to start the ball rolling, we submit the following:

A. The Act has been in effect substantially as now worded, since 1911, with some revision in 1919—1920.

B. The practice of architecture by corporations is regulated in Section 3, the first paragraph of which reads as follows:

"No corporation shall be licensed to practice architecture in this State or be granted a certificate of registration under this Act, but it shall be lawful for a stock company or a corporation to prepare drawings, plans and specifications for buildings and structures as defined in this Act which are constructed, erected, built, or their construction supervised by such stock company or corporation, provided that the chief executive officer or managing agent of such stock company or corporation in the State of Illinois shall be a registered architect under this Act, and provided further that the supervision of such building and structures shall be under the personal supervision of said registered architect and that such drawings, plans and specifications shall be prepared under the personal direction and supervision of such registered architect and bear the stamp of his official seal."

COMMENT: There have been objections to the apparent subterfuges employed by corporations in circumvention of the requirement relating to "the chief executive officer or managing agent of such stock company or corporation," and also "the supervision of such buildings and structures."

C. Section 4 exempts certain residential and farm buildings, and all buildings not exceeding \$7500.00 in cost from the provisions of this Act.

COMMENT: It is thought by some that the words relating to the minimum cost of the buildings should be repealed.

D. The qualifications for applicants for examination are in Section 5, the last three lines relating to required experience as follows:

"—and has had at least three years' experience in the office or offices of a reputable architect or architects."

COMMENT: Objections have been raised to the lack of requirements in the above section for affidavits or reliable supporting evidence by endorsers of the applicant.

E. The Department of Registration and Education is empowered by Section 15 to adopt rules and regulations for the enforcement of this Act. Such rules, last issued in 1932, place the enforcement of the administrative provisions in the Department; but do not state the required qualifications for inspectors or other officials responsible for its enforcement.

COMMENT: It has been suggested that such officers should be at least civil service employees, qualified by experience and training in the building industry.

Members' letters of comments and objections are invited to be addressed to the undersigned as soon as convenient.

—Robert L. Franklin, Chairman, Legislative Committee.

(Continued from Page 2, Column 2)

meeting of those interested in housing was therefore called for the afternoon. At this meeting Government activity in housing was represented by Col. H. B. Hackett and Angelo Clas of PWA, Miles Colean and Howard Vermilya of FHA, and Pierre Blouke of HOLC. Four of these Government officials are members of the Chicago Chapter, A. I. A., indicating that Chicago is very much on the map in the housing program. Although this meeting resulted in no epochal decisions, the air was cleared to a considerable extent and delegates who attended came away with a better realization of some of the difficulties involved in the general problem.

The convention closed Friday night with the annual dinner at the Chamberlain Hotel at Old Point Comfort. It marked the end of a delightful and inspiring convention. Few of the architects who were exposed to its influence will soon forget Williamsburg.

—John O. Merrill.

A Comment on Le Corbusier's Thesis

Sunlight, fresh air, trees, quiet along with intensive land occupancy and high speed traffic with safety, which implies absence of congestion, three or four hours less daily work, no unemployment—this in a nut shell is M. Le Corbusier's "Urbanisme." The two last are intangible by-products.

400 people occupying each gross city acre.

12% of the total area built up, 88% left for parks, streets, garages.

Major streets, centers 1300 feet apart.

Each block 39.5 acres between centers of streets.

206,500 sq. ft. of building in each block.

Buildings 16 stories high.

15,800 people (3550 families) in each block, more if parks are also provided.

990 people, 220 families on each floor.

These appear to be the physical properties of Le Corbusier's ideal.

Small houses, squalid tenements and skyscrapers are packed together and have crushed out the amenities of life. Circulation has reached the point of stagnation. And along with these conditions the average height of buildings is only 4 or 5 stories in Manhattan, and lower in the intensively built up parts of other large cities.

To correct this sordid condition he would first destroy the city, then build huge, long, narrow skyscrapers, each hundreds of feet from its nearest neighbor, blot out most of the streets and widen and elevate the few retained—and thus provide housing for 400 people to the acre, which is a substantial increase in average population density (in Manhattan), and still leave over four-fifths of the land plus the space under and atop of the buildings for playgrounds, trees and parking spaces. Grade separation would eliminate traffic danger, and the reduced need for traffic would lessen congestion.

Moreover, this reformation is expected to halt the exodus to suburbs which develop into dreary row houses on narrow lots and facing narrow streets, only to repeat the conditions at the heart of the city, with the added hardship of hours of daily travel in crowded trains, street cars and busses. In the broad sense, suburbs include all outlying areas of one-family or of one and two-family houses. The exceptions to these conditions in the city and in the suburbs affect a small minority of the people.

In passing, it may be safe to assume that he would spare the few spacious city houses, and the suburbs which consist of one-family detached houses on large lots. These may still appeal to their owners and would remain as examples to be followed by those to whom the plan does not appeal.

The picture of wasted lives, unbelievable discomfort and loss of time, enormous outlay for transportation and other public utilities is typical of great cities the world over. The cure is to rebuild the city and return to it to find sunlight, fresh air, trees, comfort and time for leisure.

Perhaps too much has already been said about the structural rebirth of great cities after this audacious plan. That part of Le Corbusier's invention is clear enough. There would be plenty of sunlight and fresh air, and playgrounds galore. But if the organizer of this new order of things should overcome the obstacles that he would encounter, and should find that the increased land values would be sufficient to carry out all improvements and provide an abundance of low rental flats, there still remains the social side which is not entirely convincing. Three problems come to mind: (1) the fate of the erstwhile occupants of slum tenements; (2) the consequences of herding all of the remaining classes of people and families from Pell Street and Washington Square, from Maxwell Street and Lake View, and from bungalows and dooryard, if they will herd, into skyscrapers, two hundred families and more on each of the 16 floors, with their open doors and cabbage, roller skates and scooters, radios and saxophones, and corridors hundreds of feet long, all dependent, with their children, their infirm and invalids, their cats and dogs, upon elevators, and (3) the not too cheery racial problems.

It is true that we have made our elevators work and that great

blocks of apartments have been built for "those who lead a life of luxury" and we might add, for some of those who don't. But it is nothing short of naive to run away with this idea and to conclude that the system can be made so gargantuan as to apply to the midgets and the mighty without years of social preparation, and without the most careful segregation in the social gamut. And who will apply the yardstick to distinguish between the refined beyond their means, and the cultured slightly below their gold standard.

We believe that when all the local exceptions, all the new and valuable improvements, both public and private, have been appraised, a greatly simplified rebuilding plan will be revealed that gradually will be tried and developed, with each succeeding project an improvement over the one which it follows. Sunlight, fresh air, trees, quiet, along with intensive land occupancy, and traffic with safety—can these be obtained without casting every unit of the city in one mould? If they can be attained with individuality, with the opportunity for the discriminating to choose his environment, the thoughtful quiet minority will give its approval.

Perhaps this leaves the problem unsolved. Le Corbusier thinks: ". . . more often of the crowds riding in the subways, going home in the evening to joyless flats . . . Millions of human beings tied to a life without hope or rest, for whom there is no sight of the sky, or the sun or good green trees. Behind the drives of Chicago there are slums . . . like another universe . . . Manhattan is a city so hostile to the most fundamental needs of the human spirit that the dream of escape takes root in every heart. To get away! Not to have to waste one's life and the life of one's family in this implacable rigidity. To open one's eyes on a bit of sky, to live close to a tree, on the edge of a lawn. And to flee forever the noise, the tumult of the city."

Will this hyperbole turn us to Le Corbusier's Utopia? We think not. The crowds that he thinks of, or may we add such part of it that needs thought and sympathy, would shrink from the rents of a modern skyscraper apartment.

The urge to own a yard, a little grass and a tree, no matter how humble, is innate in mankind. One cannot, even in a flight of fancy impelled by the desire to create an ideal "machine to live in," envisage a dream city, with buildings structurally comfortable and healthy, and see happiness where "keep off" and "forbidden" are the first written words that his children will see and must learn, and where this applies to all within its borders.

Yes, the "Radiant City" is better than some of the things that we have, but it is not the solution. After the "third metamorphosis," then what? A batch of obsolete worn out skyscrapers, and the return to smaller abodes in their stead, better lighted and oriented, perhaps, than the buildings which the "Radiant City" replaced.

Let Le Corbusier's thoughts carry him from the "life without hope in tenements" to the Mongolian Peasants and cotton belt sharecroppers where sunlight is the only thing that is abundant. Give these, all of them, three or four hours a day of work with sufficient compensation for comfort and one would flee to his own plot, another to more productive land and the third to his own farm.

Life is more abundant than that of the pioneers. The future is hopeful. And in that hope lies the doom in embryo of such gigantic mass housing as the "Radiant City."

New housing in old neighborhoods has already had a beginning. It will go much further in its scope. The replanning of several blocks at a time as one project is a temperate application of the time-honored principles to which Le Corbusier subscribes, without throwing land and social values into disorder. In Chicago, near to and surrounding the downtown district, and in Manhattan, there are many such opportunities. Land occupied by streets will be substantially reduced and dreary neighborhoods will become highly desirable residential areas.

Many an area, passé and neglected in the scramble to the subdivisions, is ready for modern treatment. If two or more blocks are assembled, streets may be vacated or relocated. New buildings will be designed and arranged to insure sunlight in all apartments. Spaces will replace courts. And provision must be made for present

and future major street circulation, and the preservation of sunlight and air. A pattern of streets suited to the motor age can be created on the lines of the old structure, with the unnecessary remainder turned into spaces, playgrounds and local circulation.

On sunlight and air and land values Le Corbusier expresses alarm: "... the Empire State Building might suck the life blood from the surrounding quarters; it might ruin a multitude of people. The Rockefeller Center might do the same, and ruin in turn the Empire State Building." We have buildings of great height which sap the vitality of whole neighborhoods—and render hundreds of lots useless, or nearly so. But will it take a Le Corbusier plan to correct this condition, which zoning has so far failed to do, or will the gradual awakening of enlightened self-interest accomplish it?

A radical achievement indeed would be control of property so that Empire State buildings could be built to occupy 10% of the lot. But regulation with or without the consent of an unintelligent few to establish an effective ratio between height and area of lot occupancy must come. It is the preferred alternative to the only valuable element in Le Corbusier's thesis.

The efficacy of Le Corbusier's plan has not been demonstrated. It is one thing to dream about the creation of a vast well organized physical plant. It is quite another to create the machinery to build it. But to recreate the social order to live with it—that is a task which the Architect would leave to another.

—H. T. Frost.

Status of Architects Registration in the U. S. A.

A map of the United States prepared by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards—an organization made up of, and controlled by the architectural registration authorities of the several states—shows that 36 states have architectural registration laws, 31 of which are members of N. C. A. R. B. Twelve states have no registration laws whatsoever. It is interesting to note that the New England states, barring Connecticut, have no registration laws.

Senior and Junior Standard N. C. A. R. B. examinations are given by the state examining boards. The Senior examination is for the convenience of the older, more experienced practicing architect who desires to acquire the privileges conferred by the certificate of the Council. This certificate facilitates obtaining the right to practice, through securing registration, in any state of the Union as nearly as this can be done under the Constitution. Architects eligible for this examination must have been legally engaged in the professional practice of architecture as a principal for a period of ten or more years and must have met the minimum education requirements prescribed by the council.

The Junior examination is for the convenience of students of architecture and younger practitioners who do not come under the Senior classification. These candidates must be graduates of accredited architectural schools or the equivalent thereof; must have had not less than three years of practical training in the offices of architects of acknowledged standing; and must have had less than ten years of independent practice as principals.

Temple Towers Before Christ

A joint expedition of the University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, and the American School of Oriental Research at Baghdad, has found ruins of a big round temple-tower at Tepe Gawra. The sweep of an almost perfect circle of brick foundations 60 feet in diameter has been unearthed. Outlines of 17 rooms can be traced. This big round house was built about 4000 B. C.

The field director of the expedition, Charles Bache, identified this as a fortress because of thick walls, single entrance, and stone weapons still lying in some of the rooms. It has temple features, too, suggested by the plan of the central rooms with an inner sanctum.

The discovery turns archaeologists to Bible history, where King Abimelech's wild and warlike reign ended in a fight at just such a temple-tower. That happened in Palestine, a little over a thousand years before Christ.

That this type of round temple-tower was old fashioned in Old Testament days, already several thousand years old, had not been suspected.

Digging at Tepe Gawra has been pushed through 13 levels of occupation, revealing city life at the earliest stage yet found. But more antiquity is in store for the diggers. For there remain seven or eight deeper layers of civilization which are now to be explored.

—*Science News Letter.*

Building the Washington Monument

The Architect and Engineer of San Francisco for April carries an interesting story on the birth and growing pains of the Washington monument at the National Capital. Stories of this chaste white finger pointing heaven-ward, ethereal through the mists and commanding in full sunlight, are always of interest. The article in question, though published anonymously, tells a human story, the high spots of which are retold below.

Congress passed an act in 1783 authorizing a memorial to George Washington. In 1791, with the founding of the Federal City, this monument might have been erected had not Washington objected to such a building during his lifetime. In 1833 patriotic citizens formed an organization to build the memorial authorized in 1783—just fifty years after the time of legal authorization. Chief Justice John Marshall was its first president. The association asked for public contributions of \$1 each, with a goal of \$1,000,000. Robert Mills' design for the monument was accepted in 1836. From 1848 on, the President of the United States was president ex-officio of the monument association.

The monument as erected is the design of Robert Mills, with the circular Greek temple surmounted by a quadriga at the base of the obelisk eliminated. In 1879 the masonry had reached the height of 174 feet above grade. The first six years of building consumed \$120,000—all the money that had been collected. Maryland marble was the material selected for the exterior. Citizens of Alabama asked the privilege of contributing stone instead of cash. The association accepted the offer and extended the invitation to contribute building stone for the monument throughout the states and foreign countries. The stones contributed bore inscriptions carrying the donor's name and these stones were used as the interior lining of the shaft. At the 174-foot level, exterior Maryland marble changes to Vermont marble for a distance of 26 feet, when Maryland marble is resumed and carried to the apex.

Political fanaticism played its part in the erection in that the "Know Nothing" party in 1854 objected to the contribution of a marble block by Pope Pius IX, carrying the inscription "Rome." On March 5 of that year, masked "Know Nothings" overpowered the night watchman and carted away the four ton stone from Rome and presumably smashed it, for it was never again seen. News of this vandalism caused contributions of stone to cease abruptly.

The monument association turned to Congress for funds early in 1855. A gang of enraged "Know Nothings" stole the records and books of the association and set themselves up as the sole members of the association. They elected officers from among themselves. The next day the public was notified that they, the new group now in possession of the records, owned and would build the monument. The new group received no contributions to carry on and Congress incorporated the Washington National Monument Association with its original membership and returned the property to the ousted officials. This was on February 22, 1859. The shaft was completed in 1888, capped with a cast aluminum tip.

To supplement the California publication, let it be said that from the entrance floor to the tip, the monument measures 555 feet 5 inches. The base is 55 feet on a side and at 500 feet up, at the base of the pyramid, the side is 34 feet, giving a taper of 10½ feet in 500 feet. Wall thickness at base—15 feet; at top—18 inches. Its commanding position in the Mall will not be challenged as long as building heights in Washington are restricted as now.

Someone has called housing a form of oratory, and slum clearance—throat clearance.

Tradition Versus Modernism

Today we discuss "Tradition versus Modernism." Tomorrow, the modernism of today will be tradition. Its sound principles will be recorded as old, not new. Its aberrations will be laughed at. Modernism which builds on tradition will last and become tradition. Modernism which defies tradition will be laughed at. For example, the architectural freaks which bite out the corner piers of buildings because steel cantilever construction makes it possible.

A fair example of architectural modernism which will last is our neighbor, Radio City. Its merits are simplicity and freedom from meaningless membering. Its demerits lie in the decorative treatment, which offers the cult of ugliness as a substitute for that of beauty—a Mexican peasant's brutishness for classic refinement. The bacteria of ugliness infect this so-called modernistic art. This is true of its architecture, its painting and sculpture, and its music.

Attempts to justify this cult of ugliness lead the world backward to the crude totem-poles and carved and painted paddles of savages.

Modernistic music attempts to justify its cacophony by pointing to Wagner and Strauss as the modernists of their times. It invites comparison between the transcendent creative genius of Wagner and Strauss, with their masterly use of cacophony, and these meaningless modernistic noises. The feeble gaspings of music-writers with no creative thoughts but only an urge to be different—to attract attention.

The same sort of urge which impelled Cézanne (or was it Matisse?) to paint those six toes on the fat leg of a bulbous, nude, lifesize female spread out on an impossible sofa. Our asylums for the mentally deficient are teeming with such urges. To regard them gravely as artistic expressions worth serious consideration is just a waste of time.

Most people know this. And the essence of it is: "Why take modernism so solemnly?"
—Walter B. Chambers.

The editor of "Architecture," under date of March 2, writes of the history of the bathtub and bathing. He says America's first bathtub was built in Cincinnati in 1842, made of mahogany and lined with sheet lead. It was publicly denounced as a luxurious and democratic vanity. Doctors called it a menace to health. In 1843 Philadelphia prohibited by ordinance bathing between November 1 and March 15. Boston made bathing unlawful except when prescribed by a physician and bathtubs were taxed \$30 yearly.

Contributors to this Issue

Howard J. White is a member of the firm Graham, Anderson, Probst & White, Architects, Chicago. The quantity and variety of the work of his firm make Mr. White an authority on the subject he discusses.

H. T. Frost, member of the firm Bennett, Parsons & Frost, Architects and Townplanners, seems particularly well fitted to discuss Le Corbusier's proposed plan for Chicago's and New York's plan rejuvenation because Mr. Frost's firm is closely identified with the Chicago Plan as administered by the Chicago Plan Commission, the plan of Washington, D. C., Buffalo and other American cities. Members of this firm were identified with reconstruction of the plan of Manila, P. I.

Walter B. Chambers is an architect of distinction practicing in New York City.

Robert L. Franklin is a Chicago architect at present functioning as one of the two editors of the proposed Chicago Building Code.

John O. Merrill is a member of the Chicago firm of Granger & Bollenbacher, Architects. He is likewise functioning as Chief Architectural Supervisor in Chicago of Federal Housing Administration.

The I. S. A. Bulletin is prepared to answer in its columns legal questions bearing on the rights of architects, their authority before the law, questions of right of lien, and all matters where building is involved. Questions must be addressed to the Bulletin. Answers will be supplied by Alexander H. Marshall, Attorney-at-Law.

Plym Fellowship Award

Eugene F. Stoyke, Chicago, graduate University of Illinois '35 with a B. S. degree, continuing his studies and achieving a Masters degree in '36 from the same institution, is the winner of the Francis J. Plym traveling fellowship for 1936-37. The problem submitted to competitors for solution was "A Stop-Over on a Transcontinental Highway." Jury of Award was E. Stanford Hall, Elmer C. Jensen, Robert C. Ostergren, William Jones Smith and Professor L. H. Provine. The winner is given \$1200 to be used toward a year of travel and study abroad.

Charles Allerton Coolidge, architect, of Boston, died at Locust Valley, New York, April 1 in his 77th year. Mr. Coolidge was a well-known figure in Chicago, having resided here about twelve years. He was born in Boston in 1858; graduated from Harvard with an A. B. degree; was special student in architecture at M. I. T.; entered the office of H. H. Richardson in 1882. On Richardson's demise in 1886, the firm of Shepley, Rutan and Coolidge succeeded to the Richardson practice. From 1914 to 1924 the firm was Coolidge and Shattuck and later Coolidge, Shepley, Bulfinch and Abbott. In Chicago his firm up to 1930 was Coolidge and Hodgdon.

Outstanding works of his firm in Chicago are the Art Institute, the Chicago Public Library, University of Chicago Law School, Commons, Medical School and Hospital, Ida Noyes Hall and a number of fine homes on North State and Astor streets. His firm was architect for the buildings of Rockefeller Institute, New York; Leland Stanford University buildings at Palo Alto, Cal.; Harvard Medical School; New York Medical School and Hospital group.

He was made Chevalier Légion d'Honneur, France, 1900; Order of the Cincinnati; an Overseer of Harvard College, where he was honored with the degree of Doctor of Arts; Past-President of the Boston Society of Architects and Fellow of the A. I. A. He was a trustee of the American Academy in Rome and director of the American Federation of Arts.

C. Howard Walker, architect, critic, and teacher, held in loving memory by architects all over the U. S., died April 12 in Boston in his 80th year. There is, perhaps, not another man in the country who, as teacher in an architectural school, endeared himself to his students as did Mr. Walker to the architectural students in M. I. T. This loving memory of him they carried through their lives, as demonstrated by the reception always accorded him throughout the country whenever he appeared at meetings of architects.

He was born in Boston in 1857. Before going to New York in '79 he studied in architects' offices. In '81 he was of the archaeological expedition excavating at Assos in Asia Minor. He began practice in Boston in '84. With Thomas Kimball he formed the firm of Walker and Kimball, 1889-1900. They were architects in chief of the Omaha Exposition, 1898. Mr. Walker designed the plan of the St. Louis Exposition, 1904.

Besides his activities as professor in M. I. T., he lectured at the Museum of Fine Arts (Boston), Lowell Institute and Harvard University. Appointed member National Fine Arts Commission by Theodore Roosevelt; member, American Academy of Arts and Sciences and National Institute of Arts and Letters; corresponding member R. I. B. A.; member of the Boston Society of Architects and Fellow of the A. I. A.

Werner Hegemann, German city planner and architect, died in New York on April 12, aged 55. Dr. Hegemann was a well-known figure in professional circles in Chicago before the World War. He was much consulted on city planning and zoning. Frequently was he heard to discuss these subjects in conferences at the City Club of Chicago. During those years he planned Washington Highlands, Milwaukee, and Wyomissing Park, Pa. His firm was Hegemann and Peets, City Planners, Milwaukee, Wis.

After the War, he became editor in Berlin of the Ernst Wasmuth publication "Staedtebau." He was author of a number of books, among which "Amerikanische Architektur und Stadtbaukunst" and "Reihenhaus-Fassaden" may be mentioned. In 1933 he returned to the U. S. and became Associate in Architecture at Columbia University. Just off the press in this country is the first of three volumes by Dr. Hegemann on City Planning and Housing.

Karl E. Jyrch, retired Chicago architect, member of the Illinois Society of Architects continuously since 1898, died March 30, aged 74, at Melbourne, Fla., where he had been spending the winter. Mr. Jyrch lived at Antioch, Ill. in recent years.